



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ance met with due reward; for he became truly proficient and the aid of his scholarship was sought by eminent men from all quarters in order to solve doubtful questions and explain obscure passages.

He published his "*Rudimenta Hebraica*" in 1506, which, though not the earliest Hebrew Grammar (for Pellicanus, his pupil had published one in 1503) yet is the first one worthy to bear the name. In 1512, his "*Grammatical Interpretation of the Seven Penitential Psalms*" appeared, and in 1518, his "*Hebrew Accents and Orthography*." These works are the bulk of his contributions to Hebrew literature, and though now of little scientific value, their historical value is great.

Reuchlin by his efforts, his example, and his teaching *created* an interest in Hebrew study throughout Germany, and the new University at Wittenberg invited him to become Professor of Greek and Hebrew, this invitation he declined; but in 1520 accepted a similar one from the University at Ingolstadt and began his lectures to upwards of 300 students. Later he was Professor at Tübingen, where he remained until his death.

One of the most important events in Reuchlin's life was his controversy with Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew. It would be interesting to follow this quarrel in its duration of six years, but time forbids. Suffice it to say, that the question was submitted to Reuchlin, whether all Hebrew books, except the Old Testament, ought not to be destroyed; and when he gave his opinion in the negative, the monks, the Inquisition, and many of the leading Universities sought to silence and condemn him as a heretic; but their efforts were unavailing, and Reuchlin was acquitted by the Pope from the charge of heresy.

Reuchlin and Erasmus are two names to be enrolled side by side at the head of the learned men, who did so much in the way of preparing for the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. They were styled and justly "the two eyes of Germany," and are to be equally honored and esteemed by all lovers of Christian truth and the purity of the Scriptures.

To Reuchlin belongs the high honor of being the first Christian student, who can be called in any real sense a *Hebrew scholar*. In all his work, he sought the truth; and when rebuked for pointing out errors in the Vulgate, the Church Bible, he said in the true spirit of Christian scholarship and with a principle, which should animate Bible students in all time. "I revere St. Jerome as an angel; I respect De Lyra as a master; but I adore Truth as a God."

E. R. POPE,
Morgan Park.

Critic and Historian.—The structural difficulties of the Old Testament are not to be ignored. In view of the questions which arise from a close study of the language of the sacred books, the processes of biblical criticism, which are provoked, are not only most natural, but highly desirable. In the current *Christian Thought* is an exceedingly valuable paper on "Historical vs. Critical Evidences," from the pen of Willis J. Beecher, D. D., professor in the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N. Y. Allowing for some degree of exaggeration in the simile, one statement which he makes may be taken as illustrating the seriousness of the difficulties with which biblical criticism aims to deal. Speaking of the linguistic signs of a later origin, occurring in the book of Ecclesiastes, ascribed to Solomon, he says:

"On the face of it, it is much as if a book should be placed in our hands, said to have been written by King Alfred, and edited in the days of James the First of England, and, on opening it, we should find that the author, from beginning to end, was familiar with Yankees and Choctaws and Greasers and Whigs and Tories and Old Hunkers, that he designated negro freedmen as contrabands, that he was in the habit of *fixing up* every thing, from a bruised finger to a state constitution, that he described plank and boards as *lumber*, and understood all the current terms in the art of telegraphing."

The above statement will appear rather strong. The spirit and sentiment of the article is, however, set against the extreme views of either critic or traditionalist. That the writer adopts a safe middle ground may be judged from the following sentences farther on :

"The historical argument is stronger when supported by the critical, and the critical, when supported by the historical. Either, if unsupported by the other, has elements of weakness. We have no logical right to neglect either. The two kinds of evidence commonly co-exist. It is seldom that a case depends exclusively upon one class of proof, and offers no opportunity for the other. And as the truth in the case is always true, it is attested by both kinds of evidence, if both are rightly understood. If the historical testimony shows that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, then the critical marks in the Pentateuch, correctly interpreted, show the same thing. If the critical marks show that the Pentateuch was written a thousand years later than Moses, then the historical testimony, taken at its true value, shows the same. Whatever be the truth, both kinds of evidence, when each is completely discovered and sifted, favor that truth." That is to say, the critical and historical witnesses as to matters of chronology and authorship in the Old Testament, whilst they may be made mutually destructive, should stand towards each other, on the contrary, as mutually corrective and corroborative.

J. W. WEDDELL,

Chicago.